

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected the application on various bases. In response thereto, Applicant has amended the application so as to overcome the rejections of the Examiner.

Specifically, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 4 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. Applicant submits that claims 1 through 4 have been cancelled. Accordingly, these rejections are deemed moot.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,676,148 issued to Gu. The Examiner has further rejected claims 1 through 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,501,480 issued to Ordelman et al. The Examiner has further rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,242,179 issued to Beddome. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as amended overcome the rejections of the prior art. With respect to each of the references, the present invention includes a drive mechanism that when mounted to a muscle-driven vehicle translates repetitive forward and backward motion of a user to a rotation of the drive wheel in the same direction. Moreover, the system is easily mountable as a supplemental drive, inasmuch as it may be coupled and decoupled from the wheelchair as desired.

To the contrary, the reference that have been cited do not have the particular structure that is disclosed and claimed. With respect to the '148 patent, this reference has a handle that is moved forward and backward. When moved forward, the motion translates to rotation; however, when moved backward, there is no coupling to the drive wheel and, in turn, the handle movement results in NO rotation of the drive wheel. With respect to the '480 patent, the crank system is rotated in a circular direction, not pivoted back and forth. Such a system is old in the art and


generally the limitations of such rotational movement are known. With respect to the '179 patent, such a construction does not lend itself to application of a supplementary system, as the system involves a complicated gearing and transmission system that is coupled to the existing axle of the rear wheels. It lacks the required structure and is not readily mounted upon a carrier which can be releasably attachable to a muscle driven vehicle.

In light of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the claims should be deemed allowable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, claims 5 through 12 should be deemed allowable. Reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Should any further fee be required, it may be charged to Applicant's attorney's deposit account 50-4229.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 9, 2008



Jovan N. Jovanovic
Reg. No. 40,039

THE WATSON IP GROUP
3133 Highland Drive, Suite 200
Hudsonville, MI 49426
(616) 797-1000 Telephone
(866) 369-7391 Facsimile